



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,378	05/22/2006	Juha Iso-Sipila	042933/379560	2561

10949 7590 08/22/2011
Nokia Corporation and Alston & Bird LLP
c/o Alston & Bird LLP
Bank of America Plaza, 101 South Tryon Street
Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

COLUCCI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/22/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/580,378	ISO-SIPILA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL COLUCCI	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 5-2-11.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 21-25,27,29-31,33 and 35-42.
3. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
 5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).**
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____ | 7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____. |

/MICHAEL COLUCCI/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

DETAILED ACTION

The following Examiners amendment is based on the claim listing filed on
10/12/2010:

In the claims:

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Drew Leyes on 07/11/2011.

Claim 42:

Line 1 **after** "The method according to claim" **delete** "38", and **insert** "39"

In the specification dated 05/22/2006:

Please number all non-paginated nineteen pages as follows.

Insert "1" at the bottom- center of page 1

Insert "2" at the bottom- center of page 2

Insert "3" at the bottom- center of page 3

Insert "4" at the bottom- center of page 4

Insert "5" at the bottom- center of page 5

Art Unit: 2626

Insert “6” at the bottom- center of page 6

Insert “7” at the bottom- center of page 7

Insert “8” at the bottom- center of page 8

Insert “9” at the bottom- center of page 9

Insert “10” at the bottom- center of page 10

Insert “11” at the bottom- center of page 11

Insert “12” at the bottom- center of page 12

Insert “13” at the bottom- center of page 13

Insert “14” at the bottom- center of page 14

Insert “15” at the bottom- center of page 15

Insert “16” at the bottom- center of page 16

Insert “17” at the bottom- center of page 17

Insert “18” at the bottom- center of page 18

Insert “19” at the bottom- center of page 19

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 21-25,27,29-31,33 and 35-42 are allowed.
2. The following is an examiner’s statement of reasons for allowance:

After careful review of the arguments presented in the prior arguments, Examiner believes that the prior art taken alone or in combination fails to teach:

Claim 38:

“in an instance in which multiple language packages are determined to be associated with the language selected for the first user interface:

determine a language selected for a second user interface; and

select one of the determined language packages based on the language selected for the first user interface and the language selected for the second user interface for use by the speech recognition system”

Claim 39:

“in an instance in which multiple language packages are determined to be associated with the language selected for the first user interface:

determining a language selected for a second user interface; and

selecting, by the processor, one of the determined language packages based on the language selected for the first user interface and the language selected for the second user interface for use by the speech recognition system”

Claim 40:

“program instructions configured, in an instance in which multiple language packages are determined to be associated with the language selected for the first user interface, to:

determine a language selected for a second user interface; and

select one of the determined language packages based on the language selected for the first user interface and the language selected for the second user interface for use by the speech recognition system”

3. Further, all arguments directed to claims 38-40 were considered in light of the specification and is believed to overcome the current references used for rejection, particularly the closest:

(A)	US 20050114114 A1	20050526	Rudolph
(B)	US 6061646 A	20000509	Martino et al.
(C)	US 7130801 B2	20061031	Kitahara et al.
(D)	US 6963836 B2	20051108	Van Gestel

Reference (A) is the closest reference and teaches the concept of a first and second language tied to a region of an interface, and reference (B) teaches languages grouped or packaged together, however the combination of choosing a language package based on two selections of languages with two different interfaces, are not explicitly taught by the prior art of record. It is not obvious to modify either of (A) or (B) with respect to one another to derive the allowed claim limitations indicated above. There is simply no mention of a second user interface for any type of reference whatsoever. Specifically, Reference (A) which is analogous to reference (B) with

Art Unit: 2626

respect to language groups teaches speech recognition and language groups that are unique and not well known, such as Romance and Germanic. (A) deals with obtaining a language group for a user of a cell phone, where language groups are present that may have overlapping languages, for instance if a user chooses Spanish... groups for **Mexico** (Spanish and English)... and **Canada** (Spanish, English, and French) will appear. However, the groups are merely language groups for a network that provide only a single language to a single user. In (A), there is no referencing of a second user interface, but merely a network. For instance if a first user is subscribed to an English cell phone service but is vacationing in a Canadian territory, the first user will be able to use a foreign network that can provide English or French to foreign users. It is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to say that, a network can be construed as a second user interface to derive a language package used that is common to a first user interface, particularly since a *single language translation* is the target goal. In no instance does (A) or the combination of (A) and (B) teach or suggest referencing a second user interface let alone selecting one of the determined language packages based on the language selected for the first user interface and the language selected for the second user interface for use by the speech recognition system.

Reference (B) teaches a speech recognition interface for a single user where multiple dictionaries are present, wherein each dictionary contains a different language to handle various languages input into a speech recognizer or language recognizer. (B) goes on to teach that dictionaries can be grouped into a single group such as Romance

Art Unit: 2626

or Germanic dictionary groups depending on language similarities which is well known globally. However, (B) does not teach or suggest a reference to any other users to uniquely group languages, wherein the dictionary groups of (B) are fixed groups.

Assuming arguendo that the language groups in (B) are not fixed, reference (B) is silent with respect to determining a language selected for a second user interface and selecting one of the determined language packages based on the language selected for the first user interface and the language selected for the second user interface for use by the speech recognition system.

Reference (C) teaches the communication between two users and the selection by each user of a display language on his/her phone, wherein only a single language is selected. While there is a second user interface referenced, there is no grouping of languages, let alone the presence of having two or more common languages for a first and second user. Reference (C) may therefore be non-analogous with respect to determining languages packages. (C) merely teaches the translation of one language to another within user interfaces.

Reference (D) merely teaches the capability of a user to select different products for speech recognition from various regions having different dialects. (D) is not analogous and does not teach or suggest the ability to determine a language selected for a second user interface or to select one of the determined language packages based

Art Unit: 2626

on the language selected for the first user interface and the language selected for the second user interface for use by the speech recognition system.

When searching for additional prior art for the limitation as recited in claims 38-40 the most relevant topics pertained to material from the same Inventor and Assignee but did not teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation of claims 38-40. Further, all claims dependent on claims 38-40 are allowed because they further limit their respective parent claims.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL COLUCCI whose telephone number is (571)270-1847. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 6:00 pm , Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)-272-7602. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2626

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael C Colucci/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626
Patent Examiner
AU 2626
(571)-270-1847
Examiner FAX: (571)-270-2847
Michael.Colucci@uspto.gov